



# MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## JOINT TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE (TCC) AND PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room  
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA  
Thursday, July 9, 2015, 5:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Boche called the meeting to order at 5:00

### ROLL CALL:

<u>TCC MEMBERS</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>CITY STAFF PRESENT :</u>
Hillary Blackerby Cynthia Boche Bob Burnham Edward France E. Howard Green Susan Horne Kathleen Rodriguez	Present Present Excused Present Present Excused Present	Browning Allen, Transportation Manager Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner Kim Thaler-Strange, Administrative Specialist Peter Brown, Mobility Coordinator Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney Derrick Bailey, Supervising Transportation Engineer Jessica Grant, Project Planner Rebecca Bjork, Public Works Director.
		<u>CITY CONSULTANTS PRESENT:</u>
PLANNING COMMISSION John Campanella Jay Higgins Michael Jordan Sheila Lodge June Pujo Deborah Schwartz Addison Thompson	Present Present Present Present Present Present Present	Melendrez Consulting (List Staff Members and tiles) Shannon Davis (Project Manager, Melendrez) Matt Benjamin (Principal, Fehr and Peers) Cullen McCormic (Transportation Planner, FP) Melanie Smith (Principal, Melendrez)
		<u>LIAISONS PRESENT:</u>
		<u>PUBLIC PRESENT:</u>

### CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:

#### 1. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comment on items not on the agenda.

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, introduced Howard Green, the newest TCC Member.

## REPORTS

### **Bicycle Master Plan Direction**

Mr. Dayton gave the background and history of the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP). He introduced the consultant team of Melendrez, and Fehr and Peers (F&P). Melendrez are the Urban Designers and F&P are the transportation engineers and planners. He requested that the Committees hold their questions until the end of the presentation, and told the Committees that staff is asking for a recommendation to Council that they direct staff and the consultants to continue to develop the draft BMP.

Ms. Boche asked for if there were any questions before the presentation. The Committee was given a copy of the report handout

Ms. Pujo asked if the Committees will vote during the comments/discussion. Mr. Dayton said that there is a recommendation and will be a vote. Staff is looking for confirmation that the engagement process was what it should be, and these are the initial improvement to be included in the Draft BMP.

Mr. Thompson added that the Committees are looking to determine if the Draft BMP is ready for Council. There will be two votes; one from each Committee.

Shannon Davis of Melendrez and Cullen McCormick of F&P introduced the team and gave background on the outreach effort and the overall timeline, and presented the results of the Community Outreach Engagement Process. The consultants discussed the data, technical analysis, additional policies and next steps. They also discussed how the Community Engagement process was done and the media used.

Ms. Davis went over the data, technical analysis and discussed additional policies and discussed next steps. She noted that there were 1,440 surveys, 190 summit participants, 25 interrupt survey, 400 interactive map participants, 143 attendees at the road show, and 640 view of the introductory video. Community groups that had road shows include: Mesa Lane Partner, COAST, SBBike, SBHS, and CEC among others.

There were two neighborhood summits on May 16<sup>th</sup>, covering the Eastside and the Westside. There was a Spanish translation available. The other road shows were on May 18-20 and included the Mesa, Downtown and Uptown Santa Barbara.

Cullen spoke about safety and closing the gaps in the network and balancing needs. He suggested a further study of road diets where there are low auto volumes. He discussed types of options and locations and asked for direction. He noted locations such as State Street, Cabrillo Boulevard, De La Vina and Chapala, the Crosstown Bike Route and the western and eastern ends of Micheltorena as well as converting on-street parking between Chino and State into green bike lanes. He noted that the Multituse path on Modoc and Las Positas will increase safety as would buffered bike lanes on Las Positas.

The consultants are looking for direction to look deeper into certain projects and doing the analysis. There are higher considerations including requirements of the ATP Grants. They closed their presentation by giving the Committees the website and Facebook Pages.

Mr. Dayton mentioned that Derrick Bailey, Jessica Grant and Peter Brown were BMP team members in the audience and were instrumental in the process and did a fabulous job.

Committee Questions:

Mr. Jordan was confused by the timeline. He pointed out that if goal is to ask for direction to move forward with the study, then it will not come back to the committees for results and discussion. How will that work? He heard a lot of projects that were not on the staff report. Looking at the timeline, will he be only seeing a Final Report? Mr. Dayton replied that the final BMP is not final until Council is done. The Committees will be getting a draft. Staff will go over and discuss as much as the committees like at that time. This meeting is important because we want the committees to ask questions and get to details to see what we are exploring. Staff wants the input. We don't want to waste time chasing things that aren't real.

Mr. Campanella: Thank You for presentation. As far as survey, one thing considered in final analysis and intricacy of layout is Cota Haley has cross corridors. Looking at future development/redevelopment is envisioned near Milpas and upper State. Where overlay and higher density is being planned for a higher number of residents. All projects have a requirement where covered bike parking is provided for all residents. Make sure that people who aren't part of survey but will be here in the future are considered. Another consideration is visitors: Clarity, especially where the pinch point at lower State is going to be with all the activity at the hotels, and the marking and education are available to visitors, especially as we go forward with new hotels. Part of education may be at hotel and bike rental level. Don't know if you got feedback from them about issues with visitors. Staff may want to double check with them and going forward, continue education and feedback from visitors. Consider future residents, visitors and workers.

Chair Boche reminded the committee this is time to answer questions

Ms. Schwartz: On pages 3 and 4 there are 24 bullet points showing recommended improvements. It will take a while to vet these and we need to know what a good timeframe is for getting feedback back; are we looking at general issues? Some of the PC will want to get a bit deeper into this, and ask questions when appropriate. Mr. Dayton replied that it is a big plan, there is a lot to cover. It might be useful to focus on the backbone first and see how far we go and then see how much time is left and then flesh it out the system. Staff are hearing that the engagement process focused the riders into certain routes. Backbone represents that. Ms. Schwartz said that we deal with this in capital improvement process. In terms of prioritizing, is this off the table for PC? We have considerations regarding timing and financing and feasibility. What kind of feedback do you want? Mr. Dayton replied that everything on the map is feasible. There were no recommendations for items that were not feasible. Buffered lanes cannot be done in many locations due to roadway widths. Off street facilities can't be done in most locations. Our role is to determine what is the right fit for the community. Ms. Schwartz also pointed out that there are lots of terms that are understandable to Transportation staff and Traffic Planners, but not to public and other Commissions. Is there a glossary for identifying terms? Mr. Dayton said that one could be put together prior to the city council meeting on the 21st.

Mr. Thompson agreed that the backbone place to focus on, and mentioned an east-west couplet at Haley and Cota. He asked why Cota was chosen as opposed to Gutierrez, which is one way. Mr. Brown replied that Cota was looked at for near-term feasibility. Gutierrez is being included as a one-way couple partner, but the City will need outside funding to rebuild the street. Cota is better for the near term in terms of adding bike lanes and maintaining two-way traffic, and Gutierrez may be long term project for adding bike lanes when the roadway and parkway are rebuilt.

Ms. Lodge asked how much do we know about bicycle traffic? Is the representation of where the accidents are where the bicycles are? Staff needs to consider where the bicycle traffic is. Mr. Brown said that ridership for commutes are being looked at. The City purchased a data set that a lot of cyclists in town are using called Strava, which shows a map of where cyclists are riding. State Street, Mission and the Castillo/Bath couplet come up and we are using that data to help develop the network.

Ms. Pujo wanted to verify that a draft would be returning to the TCC and PC prior to Council? She brought up that it is important that we take this one component that we've been working on (the physical network plan) and make sure that that fits well but that we don't forget the context of the BMP update. When it comes back, will there be updates and changes to the information in the rest of the BMP from 1998? Will there be any policy reference and changes? She would like to see those clearly shown so that we can have that discussion. In the 1998 plan we proposed something that is more indicative of where we want the network to go. She hopes this will become part of the BMP. On the overall timeline, I hope that there is sufficient public comment time as well. If there is a good amount of public review time, that may help in flushing out these things. In reading through the staff report and materials, where some of the more difficult streets were brought up, there were some that popped out (Mission, Milpas, on the eastside, and Las Positas). She would like information on how getting from Modoc through Las Positas to Downtown is resolved by this proposal. She would also like to hear and confirm that this plan for the Eastside creates an alternative. Staff has done a great job of resolving Mission Street by using Pedregosa. She would like more information on green lanes on State, and how Alamar and State will get resolved if a green lane is put in. Not a question of putting the green lane on State, but making sure that the "sticky points" are addressed.

She also asked how pedestrian crossing on bike routes that become more popular such as Alamar and State Street gets resolved. It is part of State Routes to School, but is difficult for pedestrians to cross. How do those needs get attended to as the plan is refined? Mr. Dayton replied that the BMP will have policy changes and other language including language for enforcement, education, and parking. Mr. Brown mentioned the Modoc Connection. Ms. Pujo indicated that this would be a good place to consider Modoc towards Oak Park is connected. The couplets will allow folks that wish to connect to midtown to do so going down Pueblo. Proposal does a good job of connecting Modoc to Downtown. The Eastside Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan had a lot of time and effort invested into it. The proposals here reaffirm what the community asked for. She pointed out that in the area of Alamar and State there is a gap in the network. This proposal of connecting Padre and Pueblo using Chapala street and extending De la Vina towards Padre, gets us a short term low cost solution for the significant gap closures on State. Mr. Dayton replied that the Chapala area and De la Vina going Downtown requires going to one lane. It's not a traffic issue, but that is what would be required. Topography is different in that area – there is really big hill, but it is flatter to west. Mr. Brown said that staff is looking at Padre and Pueblo as ways to connect State to De la Vina and Bath/Castillo. Ms. Pujo suggested that State Street be crossed at those locations. Mr. Dayton said it depends on which route you go. State street can use Calle Laureles on one side and Calle Palo Colorado on the other side. The green lanes offer a breadcrumb feel so that it is clear to riders which way they should go.

Ms. Rodriguez wanted to know more about Olive and Laguna as a couplet or a bicycle boulevard. Mr. McCormick gave background about bicycle boulevards. The idea is to identify streets with a low traffic volume and sets up prominent bike identification signs and large symbols. Specific treatments at intersections can help. Modifications can be made on Alisos to allow bicycles go through. Other items include smaller roundabouts, intersection improvements and stop signs for cross-traffic.

Mr. Green said that the devil is in the details, He pointed out that there are no formal opportunities for the Committees and the public to review draft. There should be time for review and reaction to drafts. Is the concept in mind how to the 1998 plan is going to be updated in terms of redlining or delineating new materials? Is feedback going to be incorporated before Council hears it? He also said that all

sharrows should be green not just certain areas. There are some that may need to be repainted. He expressed confusion in the difference between sharrows and bike lanes. He mentioned that Cota and Haley are green lined as far as Milpas, but asked if staff was proposing that the treatment should be extended there instead of one block east further on Milpas to Alisos? Mr. Dayton reiterated that there will be ample time for the Committees to review the draft. Staff would make changes and will come back to the Committees if required. The time for review is very thorough. In terms of updating we will tell Council what we are hearing. We will give them the TCC and PC recommendations. Mr Brown said that this is the kind of feedback we are looking for. We are not sure yet if there will be a greenback sharrow or parking removal. He agreed that in cases where there are sharrows, the plain ones are effective. Mr. Green asked if staff has thought about redlining plan? Mr. Dayton said that is a wholesale update. We won't be redlining. He also said that Council has asked for a different process than has been used in the past; one that is more community directed. It will be a new plan. Copies of the old plan are available for comparison.

Mr France pointed out that the level of detail compared to the 1998 plan is fairly explicit. You see all the details. He asked if staff considers this more detail than in the 1998 plan. Mr. Dayton said that when we started we knew that the simple things have been done. We have doubled the number of bike lane miles. Harder projects like Shoreline Drive were unusual. Staff is expecting more challenges.

Ms. Rodriguez said that the Bikeshare idea struck her as a great concept. It could be appropriate for Santa Barbara.

Ms. Pujo asked when the Committees would see the draft. Will the actual mapping of the critical backbone and connectors become part of the BMP? It will be important that there is a clear section on applicability and how it ties in with other city policies like the Circulation Element. It's more than Public Works driven, it can be that future and private development can be used. In whatever version, we will need some sort of cheat sheet to figure out what is out and what is in. She said that in the subcommittee for the local coastal plan there was a document that was developed to indicate what changes are being made. Mr. Dayton said that it can be done, but this process is different. All the policies are in the Circulation Element and General Plan and this is consistent with policies in place. We didn't do it a policy-driven effort to date, but that the draft BMP will indeed have goals and policies and programs like education and enforcement.

Ms. Boche said that on draft network map there are a lot of grey areas. How are those going to be included in the plan? Mr. Brown said that the grayed out areas are important and are described and categorized by neighborhood in the attached Summary Report. We are not sure we have priorities yet. We won't know this until we evaluate the projects further but we do have an idea of which projects may be longer or shorter term. The Community is overwhelmingly asking for these. If Committees make recommendation to proceed with plan, we will have a more detailed answer and can develop some project priorities.

#### Public Comment:

David Gay thanked staff and consultants. This is the greatest arc to a plan. It's a great start and the team has done a great job. The list of projects is not a plan; there are lots of policies, texts goals that need to be developed. There are a few concerns to bring forth: 1) Safety is large concern for all 2) connectivity – fill in the gaps; important to routes; make it part of the system. 3) Need – need is now and future. Especially when prioritizing. Where are the demands and the needs? Look at which ones are important. And lots of green paint

Cameron Grey from the CEC would like to express support for staff's recommendation to complete the engagement process and BMP. Hope that the BMP will include modeshare goal for bicycling and

actions that the City can take to make this goal. If we close gaps we can make bicycling more accessible and make it safer. The BMP is the first step to the benefits, and improving quality of life. He hopes the draft plan will include modeshare goals to increase bike ridership, connections to the climate action plan and has a strong basis for funding similar to the San Luis Obispo 20% model of general fund transportation dollars allocated by mode share goals.

Mike Suding is a 45 year resident of Santa Barbara. He takes the State Street routes to work. However, his family won't go riding because it is not safe. Biking should be for everyone. This plan is great. Biking is good for the City, as it allows more people to enjoy City, takes up less space.

Wilson Hubble is the past President of Bicycle Coalition and a former County employee. He is a 41 year member of AAA, who drives more than he rides a bike. Plan is good for motorists as well as cyclists. Most cyclists are drivers. Good bike facilities are good for all. Most can be done with paint, but takes courage to put paint down.

Eve Sanford: Background working in bicycle and pedestrian planning. She has a bike and uses car for longer trips. Commend staff and consultants for planning and outreach. There are some great projects. Great that Santa Barbara has worked to provide bike lanes. Projects compliment existing bikeways. Gaps create dangerous situation and are discouraging. This plan presents a series of projects that will allow safe biking. She urges the City to move forward.

Steven Bots drives more than he rides. He believes that it is safest when a driver can predict what cyclist is doing. Everyone needs to get along on the road. The BMP encourages awareness and visibility on the street. Green lanes are more visible. The BMP looks like a nice plan that moves to a more sustainable future, all different classes of users need to coexist

Dean Axelrod is a homeowner and business man, and would like to shine light on something that has not been addressed: the Value of this plan to the business community and the prosperity. We want to have the ability to attract businesses and employees; we want to make community successful in long run. Employees who want to work in Santa Barbara want to support bike infrastructure. The bike plan will help his business and help him attract the best employees for his company.

Jeff Rollings is a Homeowner and entrepreneur. Reiterating what Dean said. For business community, and parents, having a safe way to ride to work is the #1 way to encourage more usage of bike as modeshare. Employees who are starting businesses in technology sector are interested in that as an option. Would like to see adoption of the new BMP

Ira John has been biking for 30 years as commuter. Follow process, learned a lot tonight how process is working. Thanks to Ms. Pujo for asking question. He sees a piece missing- we have infrastructure; but how do you know it's the right infrastructure. Beautifully done, good engineering, lots of details, but would like to see what we want plan to do for us; for the community. Biking can serve this community. The policy will come in words, and is the glue, and then we can ask if this plan serves the community. Like to see process set some bold goals for community. Commuting is not up there on stats. He would like to see discussion around electric bikes. How can infrastructure help commuters. This is a rare opportunity set goals and have a big vision for community. He thanked Ms. Lodge for the statistics. We need data. Do these treatments work? He would love to work on vision zero.

Daniel Fishbein showed a map of fatal collisions in the past 13 years. He wants to speak to vision zero and bmp. Safety has to be part of plan. He will supply info he developed about safety and noted that 50% of bicycle collisions involve bike only and mainly unhelmeted cyclists. Safety has to be not only with better roads but better bicycle behavior.

Christine Holvic: Santa Barbara business owner and homeowner. We are all recreational and transportation cyclists. Two have had serious crashes (she has permanent brain injury). If you don't ride a bike, don't look at this plan like a car driver. Trust those who ride bikes as we look at roads from different perspective. It is different viewpoint.

#### Committee Comments

Ms. Blackerby appreciates the questions about where are we going? She appreciates public comment and engagement and thanked the staff and consultants. She attended one of the summits and thought it was well done. For what staff is asking for as far as feedback; all the draft network facilities are good. Some will be easier to craft. This is a master plan, not just a project. Not as big as General Plan, but still big and important. It won't all be done in the next two years. Setting out that map to move forward and see where we want this to go. She is supportive of the proposal, and the backbone and spine – green bike lanes are great. Los Carneros now has green lanes and it's helpful on how to get through intersection. They stand out. State and De la Vina/Chapala is important. Micheltorena is important. This has an opportunity to be a great backbone. Looking at Cota is great because it needs work, and is better than Gutierrez. Green pieces are great. However, we have to weight loss of parking. She was expecting a greater loss, but there will be tradeoffs. She's been wanting the couplet at Bath and Castillo extended for years. Pedregosa is a good idea; Mission is scary. Olive and Laguna will take analysis. A connection to Modoc could be good; that needs some work. Appreciate looking at Wentworth and Rancheria. She recently moved to West Beach area. The Ortega overcrossing is really nice. Being able to connect through the neighborhood would be nice. She likes the idea of a bike boulevard, and moving through eastside, connecting Old Coast Highway to Canada. The Upper State workshop she learned about the Foothill route through neighborhood. Talked about Las Positas and Cliff and making it all work. She is excited about multi-purpose path. She appreciates people bringing up business aspect and really hopes that folks get creative in plan. What are they doing with bikes? What about safe bike storage? What can we do in neighborhoods to make bike parking safer? We have had a great experience with bike corrals. They are well liked and used, businesses want them. Hope we will get serious about putting those in. If dreaming big on networks, let's dream big on parking facilities.

Mr. Higgens thought it was excellent presentation; well researched and professional. The BMP looks digestible and understandable. He supports it. He would like to see staff make an attempt to prioritize with analytics. There has to be some way of modeling components, such as population density served by improvements, safety data for particular area and funding. Staff will get some flak for quality of the survey instrument. Encourage staff to emphasize how project and plan addressed both crowds. Bottom half of Santa Barbara well mapped out, but top half is short changed mainly due to population density. In the field of planning we think regionally. Poll people out of neighborhoods, connections are needed on 192 which cross into County. Staff should consider analysis and putting them on the priority list. Lots of people use 192. Cliff going into Hope Ranch is a great place to ride; maybe put some thought in there. He would love to see the Foothill route discussed, and one way improvements for vehicular traffic to open route to pedestrians and cyclists.

Ms. Pujo said that in listening to discussion and comments, really find that there has been a rare synergy in terms of comments, haven't heard anything I disagree with. To that end, regardless of turnaround, would love to see a bullet point summary list of good comments brought up today which would make a good checklist to refer to in future. Having been part of the group that developed Circulation Element. In watching general plan, find that the bones of this to be in line with goals of the Circulation Element and General Plan. There is a slight caveat: can only do one piece of a plan at a time, she would like to see information in staff report of presentation about how does this piece fit in with other transportation components. This is multimodal and it is important to develop in cohesive way. She would like some sense of how that fits in with other pieces. Some of details of plan, mention backbone which is interesting because she is familiar with most of it, particularly in northern part. Live

on Chapala and own property on Micheltorena where green is noted. Any plan will result in the new and different, and change for the greater good it makes sense in location and will all be exiting improvement once we get used to the idea. Where parking does need to be removed, we need to deal with other pieces and hope when plan comes back we can accommodate losses. This is a very good plan and she is supportive. Lastly, it is going to be important that we have ample opportunity to review the draft when it is a bit more flushed out. Mr. Higgens mentioned edges of City near the City/County areas. In addition to general public comment when draft comes back, it is important that we get comments from other jurisdictions. Supporting recommendation but in the theme of community input there is concern regarding the wording. So that people are not led to think that the public input process is over. Mr. Dayton said that the first community engagement is complete. M

Ms. Schwartz commended Council and staff and general approach. Community engagement component has been so important and references data that illustrates that we have been able to engage enough of the public that under page 6, we note that 51% expressed that main mode is car. If we only engaged the cycling community we'd not have this feedback. We have really gone the distance in engaging the community. It is really difficult to engage full spectrum. She commends staff and consultants. She attended Downtown summit which reflected diversity of community. She contrasted the BMP with the 1998 plan and thinks we can do a lot better. We should restructure plan to make it more contemporary. Ch 4 is goals policies and coordination. If we contrast that with General Plan Chapter 4 needs to be a Chapter 1 as far as principles, goals and policies. They need to be synced with those that now exist. In terms of goals, there were concerns at the PC meeting in April about insufficiently defined goals. She heard members of public speak to this. We need to have clearly defined bold goals from which flow the community engagement, the infrastructure and network. Without them being anchored to the vision of where we are going, these are only technical projects. She concurs that we reconsider language to what we are doing tonight, going back to principals goals and polices. In terms of prioritization - for this to make sense to next set of decision makers, look at prioritization in terms of short term, long term and financially feasible, similar to Cliff Drive, so we can take this up as soon as possible to make these improvements, and that we move forward with the least cost that will give us highest yield. She suggested that staff do a triage on this list of 24 projects in terms of short term and long term goals and policies. She thinks public education is key for changing infrastructure. Robust education is needed.

Mr. Jordan went to 4 of the 5 summits and was impressed with the job done by staff and consultants. In hindsight it is a shame how few people showed up for the Eastside summit, since it targeted those who have to bike. He is bothered by the timeline. As we get to end of year, with a draft coming in fall, after November it will disappear until February. He would like to see more info before the draft goes to Council. This is the first time we saw notes on loss of parking. This makes him less of an advocate. Staff needs to make attempt to prioritize the bullets on where those fit on timeline, or sooner or longer, less or more expensive, return on investment. This will enable a position to push for a commitment to this process. People need to lobby for commitment. More information is needed there. There needs to be some way of quantifying. He intrigued by business and employee benefit; that is something that needs to be looked at. The flag is waved heavily in presentation to Council. He also noted bicycle accidents mostly the cyclists are at fault. We need to talk to priorities and focus in those areas and accidents. Some were cyclists at fault, not having better alternatives. We should be offering better choices to them. He goes down Shoreline and up State; he hates Cliff. We deserve a reasonable expectation of safe and convenient experience for all. He is supportive on street changes to be made. Agrees with Deborah's comments with goals. Focus of BMP to engage community. Focus should be to have a tangible set of actions, and principles, goals and policies. The BMP is missing what you want to accomplish and how to get there. He would like to see better acknowledgement of Shoreline coming off the Mesa rather than Cliff. Traffic is currently light on East Cabrillo to 101 won't always be that way. Too much of an east-west gap between Cota and Micheltorena. The point needs to be stressed that improvements in infrastructure are improvement in pedestrian and driver infrastructure.

Mr. France gave kudos to the team. Staff did what asked in exemplary fashion. What we are hearing from outreach, what the community is telling us, is that we need goals and network and that we haven't built a complete network. Also we need some level of ambition to serve some level of cyclists and have a bike plan for everyone. We are looking at a plan that continues on the Circulation Element. It should be easy to choose your mode. The City dropped the ball on bikeway network. There is not much data. We want to take a good hard look at how we can serve the community's needs and look at the data through the lens of a goal. We need to address safety and modeshare. A great goal is short trips that should be easy by bike. Agree to listen to the cyclist. Look at levels of stress. There is a lot of stress because its incomplete. 10 blocks of parking removal is a radical concept. Staff and the consultants look at completing the network and tradeoff has been minimized. Micheltorena is half of the parking removal and there are alternatives for that. The return on investment is less going block by block. Closing the gap is priority. Support moving forward.

Ms. Lodge reminded everyone that the survey was self selected. There are a lot who cannot and don't ride bikes. The team has done a good job and got good input and can support moving forward but suggest that Micheltorena, as with Mission and Pedregosa and use it instead of Micheltorena as it is a low traffic street.

Mr. Campanella: Community Development will report in September about implementation of General Plan. They will be going down each implementation item and saying what actions are being taken. Look upon this as there are a number of policies. In the presentation to Council, you touch upon goals and how we are going to satisfy them. As far as the consultants, you've done studies and have a grid and street network in place accomplishes a lot. The cost is incremental. He is hopeful that the cost estimate on this is small. There could be a conversion of the number of people that bike and drive. If we can reduce 6 trips a day by converting bikes to drivers, the goal can be achieved. We need an implementation tool of policies, and see the issue of survey that took place to communicate. Staff has accomplished both by doing what was instructed, and considering General Plan Integration. We can improve the experience for visitors by looking at how to consider conflicts and the education aspect. Encourage them to bring bike. He recommends move forward

Mr. Green complimented staff and consultants well done. There is the potential for unfulfilled expectation. Lots of things can be long term if they are not spelled out in this go around. Streets should be identified. Would like the charts that go to Council, the process charts, at the beginning and end of presentation, include insertion of a block for October which will highlight the role that the Committees need to have; we aren't on that block.

Mr. Thompson said that staff did an excellent job. There were good suggestions from community. Emphasize he likes the idea of including program goals and purpose in the draft BMP and implementing General Plan prioritization. The BMP is efficient in talking about connectivity beyond boundaries of City. We got good feedback and are ready to move forward.

Ms. Rodriguez would like to get back to the word complete. Complete can mean over or through. Is the intention to say that the engagement process is thorough and adequate or is there another word? We need to be clearer on the wording. Mr. Dayton was comfortable with the language that we chose regarding the recommendation. The staff report has a different recommendation than the presentation. There were a lot of people who commented and we want to take all these comments but there was a set time that we collected the comments.

Mr. Jordan commented that we need to also work on City requirements for bicycle storage in approved projects.

Ms. Pujo. As to the language in the recommendation. Recommend that the council authorize the next phase of the project to develop the draft BMP which includes further analysis for all the bicycle network improvements

Motion: Recommend that the council authorize the next phase of the project to develop the draft BMP which includes further analysis for all the bicycle network improvements

Motion Made by France, Seconded by Blackerby

Ayes: 5      Noes:      Absent (2)(Burnham, Horne) Abstain

Motion: (PC) Recommend that the council authorize the next phase of the project to develop the draft BMP which includes further analysis for all the bicycle network improvements

Motion Made by Pujo, Seconded by Schwarz

Ayes: 5      Noes:      Absent: 2 (Lodge, Higgs)      Abstain

Mr. Dayton had some closing comments: Thank you all we appreciate comments. One tenor that I heard loud and clear that we have not thought about is that there are all these General Plan policies that say we should do all of this and we've not talked about it. We can say this is what the TCC and PC spoke clearly about.

Mr. Green asked if a date had been determined. What is date? Mr. Dayton Replied that the meeting was on July 21 and it was an evening session, 6:00 P.M. He reassured that Mr. Green that the TCC and PC meeting was televised.

Chair Boche adjourned the meeting at 8:17